UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,376	02/23/2004	Arvind Sundararajan	ORACL-01391US1	8926

80548   7590   12/24/2008
Fliesler Meyer LLP
650 California Street
14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108

EXAMINER
PATEL, MANGLESH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 November 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *11,13-15,17-19,21 and 22* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *11,13-15,17-19,21 and 22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This **FINAL** rejection is responsive to the RCE filed on 11/5/2008.

2.   This is a first action final since no claim amendments or arguments were submitted with the RCE.

3.   In the continuation claims 11, 13-15, 17-19 and 21-22 remain pending. Claims 11, 15 and 19 are the independent

claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this

Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
> subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill
> in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

5.   Claims 11, 13-15, 17-19 and 21-22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Darugar (U.S.

Pub 2003/0018661, filed Jul 18, 2002 with provisional date of Jul 19, 2001) in view of Vedula (U.S. 6,823,495, filed Sep 14,

2000).

Regarding Independent claims 11, 15 and 19, A computer-implemented method comprising: converting first XML

data into second XML data having a different shape; and converting the second XML data to JAVA data; wherein the

second XML data has the same shape as the Java data, such that the second XML data and Java data are laid out and

structured in the same way.

Darugar teaches converting from a first XML format to a second XML format using an interface to associate elements

(See abstract). The claims describe a mapping function by defining transformation between formats as indicated by

shapes. In paragraph 43 Darugar describes the mapping shown in fig 4 from a XML format to a target XML format.

Furthermore he suggests that Java code can be incorporated into the mapping via a graphical development environment

(paragraphs 6-10 & 31-33). Therefore a skilled artisan would easily be able to use the teachings of Darugar to include

transformations between XML and Java by graphical mapping. Although Darugar describes mapping that includes

converting from a first to a second XML data and then suggesting the use of java with the invention for further

mappings, he fails to explicitly describe the different shapes. Instead Vedula also describes the use of a graphical

mapping tool to map from one XML format to another XML format (see abstract). Vedula further shows in fig 5

wherein the mapping includes different shapes as represented in numeral 16b. Thus both Darugar and Vedula teaches

the conversion from a first XML data into a second XML data which is conversion from XML to an intermediate

representation Darugar further suggests the use of Java for the mappings. Vedula for example shows in figure 1

numeral 18a as first XML data being converted to a second XML data represented in an intermediate representation

numeral 16b having a different shape which is then converted to another format 18a thereby having the same structure

and layout as the intermediate format thereby representing same structure but in different formats. At the time of the

invention it would have been obvious for the skilled artisan to have implemented the mapping of XML to Java taught

by Darugar into the teachings of Vedula. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the graphical mapping

between Java and XML objects thereby saving time from coding.

Regarding Dependent claims 13, 17 and 21, wherein XQuery is used to convert the first XML data to the second

XML data.

Darugar in paragraph 31 describes that " an interface can allow a user to enter, for example, a SQL statement with

placeholders as a **query** to a database." Therefore he suggests that the mapping tool includes querying of data from a

database to perform the graphical mappings. The skilled artisan would easily see that the mapping tool not only allows

mapping from XML format to another XML format but supports JAVA mappings and allows query instructions to

allow mapping between databases in different source and target formats.

Regarding Dependent claims 14, 18 and 22, wherein a query engine converts the second XML data into the Java

data.

Darugar in paragraph 31 describes that " an interface can allow a user to enter, for example, a SQL statement with

placeholders as a **query** to a database." Therefore he suggests that the mapping tool includes querying of data from a

database to perform the graphical mappings. Hence to retrieve data from a database includes querying which includes a

query engine to extract such data from a database so that it could be mapped between source and target formats has

described by Darugar. The skilled artisan would easily see that the mapping tool not only allows mapping from XML

format to another XML format but supports JAVA mappings and allows query instructions to allow mapping between

databases in different source and target formats.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant filed arguments in the after final response dated 8/25/2008, those arguments have already been addressed in the AF response dated 9/22/2008. No additional arguments or claim amendments were submitted for reconsideration in this RCE.

Conclusion

This is a RCE of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/784376. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner (AU 2178)
December 18, 2008

/Manglesh M Patel/
Manglesh Patel
Examiner, Art Unit 2178

| | /CESAR B PAULA/ |
| | Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178 |